

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,752	10/01/2003	Donald Alfons Kubik	NTIC-F-CON-CIP (NTICPO113	7936
28862	7590 07/07/2006		EXAM	INER
HUDAK, SI	HUNK & FARINE, CO., 1	TOOMER, CEPHIA D		
2020 FRONT STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 307 CUYAHOGA	FALLS, OH 44221	1714		
	,		DATE MAILED: 07/07/2000	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/676,752	KUBIK ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Cephia D. Toomer	1714
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC EFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- on. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT statute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. UNDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	13 April 2006.	
	This action is non-final.	·
3) Since this application is in condition for al	•	rs, prosecution as to the merits is ~
closed in accordance with the practice un	-	
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the applica	tion.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		• .
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		· .
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	·	y the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection t	•	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the o	correction is required if the drawing(s	s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by t	he Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo	reign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority docu	ments have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docu	ments have been received in Ap	plication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	e priority documents have been i	eceived in this National Stage
application from the International B	sureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
* See the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the certified copies not r	eceived.
•		
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview So	ummary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94	Paper No(s)	/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5B/08) 5) Notice of in	

Art Unit: 1714

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to the election/restriction in which Applicant elected Group I, claims 1-6 and canceled claims 7-15. Since Applicant has canceled the non-elected claims and presented no arguments with respect to the restriction, the restriction is made FINAL.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-6 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 and 9-19 of copending Application No. 10/676,760. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the composition of the present invention contains all of the components recited in 10/676,760 but also contains additional

Application/Control Number: 10/676,752

Art Unit: 1714

components and has a different intended use. Intended use is given no patentable weight in claims that are directed to the composition per se.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boerwinkle (US 4,290,912) in view of Schmidt (US 3,354,117) and Wysong (US 4,119,604).

Boerwinkle teaches plastic articles comprising a polyolefin polymer, an inorganic nitrite salt, a trisubstituted phenol and fumed silica (see abstract; col. 1, lines 30-41). The polyolefin includes low density polyethylene, polypropylene, etc. (see col. 1, lines 53-56; Example 3). The nitrite is sodium nitrite (see col. 1, lines 61-64). Boerwinkle teaches that the composition provides volatile corrosion inhibition for sheet materials useful for packaging metal parts (see col. 1, lines 17-22; col. 2, lines 59-62). Boerwinkle teaches the limitations of the claims other than the differences discussed below.

In the first aspect, Boerwinkle differs from the claims in that he does not specifically teach the addition of zinc oxide or sodium silicate.

However, Schmidt teaches stabilized olefin compositions comprising 2,4,6-trisubstituted phenol and zinc oxide. Schmidt teaches that zinc oxide is used in polyolefins as a stabilizer and filling material (see abstract).

Application/Control Number: 10/676,752

Art Unit: 1714

Wysong teaches a polymer composition wherein the adjuvants commonly used in polyolefin resins include butylated hydroxytoluene, fumed silica and sodium silicate (see col. 6, lines 34-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include sodium silicate or zinc oxide in the polymer composition because Schmidt and Wysong teach that these compounds are adjuvants commonly used in polyolefin resins.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the proportions of the adjuvant components through routine experimentation for the best results. As to optimization results, a patent will not be granted based upon the optimization of result effective variables when the optimization is obtained through routine experimentation unless there is a showing of unexpected results which properly rebuts the *prima facie* case of obviousness. See *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 276, 205 USPQ 215, 219 (CCPA 1980). See also *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936-37 (Fed. Cir. 1990), and *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cephia D. Toomer whose telephone number is 571-272-1126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/676,752 Page 5

Art Unit: 1714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cephia D. Toomer Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714

10676752\20060624